

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

By the present amendment, claims 1-4 and 10-11 have been cancelled. Claim 12 has been amended in order to incorporate subject matter from cancelled claim 1. New claims 50-53 have been added which are directed to specific embodiments and find support in previous claims 10 and 11. The amendments to the claims have been made without prejudice and without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's objections. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue any of the deleted subject matter in a further continuation, continuation-in-part or divisional application. The amendment does not contain new matter and its entry is respectfully requested.

The final office action dated August 8, 2007 has been carefully considered. It is believed that the amended claims submitted herewith and the following comments represent a complete response to the Examiner's rejections and place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 10-13, 17 and 22 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, the Examiner feels that the language "an *in vitro* system" is unclear. In response, claims that are directed at the *in vitro* system have been cancelled. Claims 12 and 22 have been amended in order to remove reference to an *in vitro* system.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully request that the objection to claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

35 USC §103

The Examiner is maintaining the objection to claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaleco et al (2001, J. Exp. Med. 194:991-1001); Nakano et al (1994, Science 265:5175); and Tatsumi et al (1990, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 87:2750-2754).


Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been cancelled by the present amendment which overcomes the objection.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully request that the objections to the claims under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, we submit that the application is in order for allowance and an early indication to that effect would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner like to discuss the matter, he is kindly requested to contact Micheline Gravelle at 416-957-1682 at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas M. Schmitt et al.

By 
Micheline Gravelle
Reg. No. 40,261

Bereskin & Parr
Box 401, 40 King Street W
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5H 3Y2

Tel: 416-957-1682
Fax: 416-361-1398